REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 16-33 remain in the application. Claims 16-33 are subject to examination. Claims 16 and 25 have been amended.

On page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification because of a informality. The Examiner stated that the element with reference numeral 14 should be called a compressor instead of a turbine.

The paragraph on page 6, lines 24-29 has been amended to associate reference numeral 14 with a compressor.

On page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 25-33 because of a informality. The Examiner stated that the heat exchanger is part of the rotor, but the claims recite two separate elements.

Claim 25 has been amended to specify that the rotor includes a heat exchanger disposed therein. Support for the change can be found by referring to claim 16, for example.

Applicant appreciates the time and effort of the Examiner in indicating the informalities.

Claim 16 has been amended to define a step of: radially dissipating heat away from the second heat exchanger, through the annular gas chamber and away from an exterior of the gas chamber. Claim 25 has been amended to specify that said annular gas chamber configured to radially conduct heat away from said heat exchanger. Support for the changes can be found by referring to Fig. 1, which shows the arrows 20 indicating the heat being radially dissipated away from the gas chambers 17a-17d and through the cooling ribs 19. Additional support can be found by referring to page 7, lines 6-20 of the specification.

On page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 25, 27-29, 32, and 33 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,404,426 to Laing under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claim 25 now specifies that the heat exchanger is surrounded by a substantially annular gas chamber divided, in a radial direction, into a plurality of ring-cylindrical partial chambers; and that the annular gas chamber is configured to radially conduct heat away from the heat exchanger. Laing do not teach such features.

Laing teaches a evaporator heat exchanger 1 and a condensing heat exchanger 3 that also act as centrifugal fans or blowers (column 3, lines 60-61). The evaporator heat exchanger 1 is constructed with a number of secondary heat-storage containers 15 located therein (column 4, lines 48-54). Fig. 3

shows a fin 13 of the evaporator heat exchanger 1 and shows that the evaporator tubes 121, 121a and the secondary heat-storage containers 15 are constructed within the fin 3 (column 6, lines 30-40). The condensing heat exchanger 3 is constructed with containers 36 formed therein. The containers 36 are formed as tubes filled with a heat storage substance (column 5, lines 1-13).

Laing does not teach a substantially annular gas chamber divided, in a radial direction, into a plurality of ring-cylindrical partial chambers, wherein the annular gas chamber surrounds the heat exchanger. Laing does not teach an annular gas chamber that is configured to radially conduct heat away from the heat exchanger. The invention as defined by claim 25 is not anticipated by Laing.

On page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 16-24 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. US 4,004,426 to Laing in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,956,899 to Kronogard under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The Examiner stated that Kronogard is relied upon to disclose a gas turbine system, and that it would have been obvious to provide the gas turbine system taught by Kronogard instead of the fluid driven engine taught by Laing. Even if that were the case, the invention as defined by claim 16 would still not have been obtained.

Laing merely teach an evaporator heat exchanger 1 and a condensing heat exchanger 3 that also act as centrifugal fans or blowers (column 3, lines 60-61). The evaporator heat exchanger 1 is constructed with a number of secondary heat-storage containers 15 located therein (column 4, lines 48-54). Fig. 3 shows a fin 13 of the evaporator heat exchanger 1 and shows that the evaporator tubes 121, 121a and the secondary heat-storage containers 15 are constructed within the fin 3 (column 6, lines 30-40). The condensing heat exchanger 3 is constructed with containers 36 formed therein. The containers 36 are formed as tubes filled with a heat storage substance (column 5, lines 1-13).

Kronogard merely teach a circulating medium that is fed through a first heat exchanger 18 located inside a main part 10 and then to a second heat exchanger 19, which is located inside a main part 10, in order to heat the circulating medium (column 2, lines 11-15).

Claim 16 includes steps of: guiding the working medium through a second heat exchanger disposed inside a rapidly rotating rotor, the rotor having an exterior surrounded by at least one substantially annular gas chamber; and radially dissipating heat away from the second heat exchanger, through the annular gas chamber and away from an exterior of the gas chamber.

Neither Laing nor Kronogard teach or suggest the steps of claim 16 that have been listed above. Neither reference teaches or suggests a substantially annular gas chamber that surrounds a rotor. Neither reference teaches or suggests radially dissipating heat away from a second heat exchanger, through the annular gas chamber and away from an exterior of the gas chamber.

On page 3 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 26 has been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,004,426 to Laing in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,781,241 to Misage et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Even if it would have been obvious to combine the cited references, the invention as defined by claim 26 would not have been obtained for the reasons specified above with regard to claim 25.

On page 4 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 30 has been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,004,426 to Laing in view of German Patent Application No. DE 38 07 783 A1 to Engel under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Even if it would have been obvious to combine the cited references, the invention as defined by claim 30 would not have been obtained for the reasons specified above with regard to claim 25.

On page 4 of the above-identified Office Action, claim 31 has been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,004,426 to Laing in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,491,141 to Severinsson under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Even if it would have been obvious to combine the cited references, the invention as defined by claim 26 would not have been obtained for the reasons specified above with regard to claim 25.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 16 or 25. Claims 16 and 25 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 16 or 25.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 16-33 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of three months pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in the amount of $525.00 in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

Please charge any other fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Werner H. Stemer/
Werner H. Stemer
(Reg. No. 34,956)

MPW:cgm

April 30, 2008

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101